

REMARKS

Claims 1-27 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 13, 20, 25, 26 and 27 have been amended as shown on pp. 2-6 of the Reply. Applicants' representative thanks the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conversation of January 10, 2007, wherein the Examiner indicated that the amendments made herein should place the subject application in better condition for allowance.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13-16, 19-23 and 25-27 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-5, 7-9, 11, 13-16, 19-23 and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Cabler (US 2002/0099966). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cabler does not teach or suggest each and every aspect of the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it *expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim*. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The *identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim*. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (emphasis added).

Applicants' claimed subject matter relates to a power management system that intelligently manages a state machines wake state to reduce power consumption and provides a timely response to a signal directed to the state machine. Independent claim 1 (and similarly independent claims 13, 20 and 25-27), as amended, recites *a state management component that evaluates a signal to ascertain whether at least one of a coprocessor or a state machine services the signal*. Cabler fails to teach or suggest these novel features.

Cabler merely relates to a simplistic wake up circuit employed in telecommunication analog front ends. The circuit includes a 1st detection module that detects the presence of an incoming signal on a data path. If a signal is present on the data path, a 2nd detection module is enabled which then determines if a particular characteristic of the incoming signal is one of a known set of characteristics and enables modem circuitry only when a match in characteristics is obtained. More specifically, the 2nd detection module is utilized to make a decision regarding the characteristics of the incoming signal and determine whether the modem should be enabled or not. Once enabled, the modem further processes the received signal. However, Cabler fails to disclose a coprocessor that can process the received signal completely without having to transition the modem out of the low power state.

Applicants' subject matter, in contrast, discloses a system that receives an incoming signal, intelligently decides which out of a coprocessor or a state machine can process the signal and wakes the appropriate device to service the request by transitioning it to a high power state. Particularly, the state management component interprets the incoming signal and determines whether the state machine should transition out of a wake and respond to the incoming signals or whether a separate low power element, such as a coprocessor should respond to the signals and process them. If determined that the low power coprocessor is capable of processing the incoming request, then it is invoked and transitioned out of its low power state. Thus, the coprocessor can service the incoming signal without having to transition the state machine to a high power state. Cabler is silent with regard to a low power component that is enabled to process the received data such that the state machine can remain in a low power state.

Furthermore, independent claims 1, 13, 20 and 25-27, as amended, recite similar aspects, namely, *a state machine that services the signal upon the evaluation that the coprocessor cannot service the signal without transitioning the state machine to the high power state*. If the state management component determines that the coprocessor cannot handle the received request then the state machine is enabled by transitioning it out of the low power state and employed to process the incoming signal. Cabler fails to suggest this novel feature.

Accordingly, in view of at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1, 13, 20 and 25-27 (and claims 2-5, 7-9, 11, 14-16, 19 and 21-23 that depend there from) is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 6, 10, 12, 17, 18 and 24 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 6, 10, 12, 17, 18 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Cabler (US 2002/0099966). This rejection should be respectfully withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Cabler does not disclose or suggest each and every aspect set forth in the subject claims.

To reject claims in an application under §103, an examiner must establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. A *prima facie* case of obviousness is established by a showing of three basic criteria. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP §706.02(j). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on applicant's disclosure. See *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). (emphasis added).

Claims 6, 10, 12, 17, 18 and 24 depend from independent claims 1, 13 and 20 which relate to a state management component that determines whether a coprocessor or a state machine can be enabled to service an incoming signal. The coprocessor can be activated to service the received signal without transitioning the state machine to a high power state. However, if it is determined that the coprocessor cannot handle the incoming request alone, the state machine is employed to process the request by transitioning out of a low power state. Cabler fails to teach or suggest all features of applicants' subject matter and thus fails to make obvious the claimed invention as recited in claims 6, 10, 12, 17, 18 and 24. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP563US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/

Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731